MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
19 NOVEMBER 1963

INDEX

	Page
ADMINISTRATION	
1. Approval of Minutes	1
2. Date of Next Meeting	1
3. Revised Preliminary Budget Request, Fiscal Year 1965	1
SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS-INTERVIEWS	
1. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service	
a. Federal Office Building No. 5-Revised Design	1-2
b. Regional Office Building-Alterations to Exterior	2-3
c. Bureau of Printing and Engraving-Alterations	3
2. District of Columbia Government, Department of Buildings and Grounds	
District Building-Proposed Location of Flagpoles	3-4
3. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, National Capital Region	
a. Marion Park, Reservation No. 18, E St., S.E. between 4gh and 6th Streets-Revised Design	4
b. Bridge over Rock Creek at Calvert St., N.W.O Proposed Design	4
4. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, National Institutes of Health	4-5
Addition to Building 12-Proposed Design	
5. Department of the Treasury-Bureau of the Mint	
a. Nevada Centennial Medal - Proposed Design	5-6
b. Design of Medals-Appointment of Mrs. Saarinen as Sub-Committee to Investigate Procedures	6
6. Department of Commerce	
Official Seal-Proposed Design	6

7. District of Columbia Government, Department of Licenses and Inspections

a. Shipstead-Luce Act

(1) Watergate Development-Conference with Architect 7-9

(2) Building Applications-Appendix 1 10

b. Old Georgetown Act, Public Law 808, 81st Congress

Building Applications-Appendix 2 10

8. English Speaking Union

Sir Winston Churchill Memorial Statue-Proposed Site 10-11

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
19 November 1963

The Commission met, pursuant to notice, in executive session, at 10:15 a.m., with William Walton, Chairman, presiding.

Present were: Members - William Walton
Burnham Kelly
Gordon Bunshaft
Theodore Roszak
Aline Saarinen
Hideo Sasaki
John Carl Warnecke

Staff: L. R. Wilson, Secretary
C.H.Atherton, Asst. Sec'y
C.L.Martin, Counsel
Myra Younker, Editor
Leone Vialpando, Recorder

I. ADMINISTRATION

1. Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the October meeting were approved as drafted.

2. Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Commission was set for 18 December 1963 at 9:30 a.m., with an executive session on 17 December 1963 at 10:15 a.m.

3. Revised Preliminary Budget Request, Fiscal Year 1965

The members were informed that pursuant to the discussion at the October meeting the Chairman had submitted to the Bureau of the Budget a preliminary budget request for the sum of $193,000. Following a conference with Bureau officials the Chairman had been informed that the budget request was approved with the exception of $5,000 allocated to equipment for the gallery. The members expressed their satisfaction that a request for $188,000 had been approved.

II. SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS-INTERVIEWS

1. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

a. Federal Office Building No. 5 - Revised Design

The members were told that new studies of the massing of the building as a single structure without wings had been prepared by the architects and would be presented on the following day.

It was also reported that the new concept of the building had been discussed by the architects and representatives of the Public Buildings Service at the November meeting of the Federal Planning and Projects Committee of the National Capital Planning Commission. The Committee had concluded that the matter should not be presented to the full Commission until such time as a final agreement in principle had been reached between the Public Buildings Service and the Commission of Fine Arts.

No action was taken pending the conference on the following day.

b. Regional Office Building - Alterations to Exterior

The members were shown photographs, drawings and a rendering of a proposal to rehabilitate the exterior of the General Services Administration Regional Office Building located on D Street, S.W., between 7th and 9th Streets.

It was explained that the structure, which is constructed of reinforced concrete, was erected in 1931-32 for use as a federal warehouse prior to its conversion to an office building for Region Three of the General Services Administration. It is a seven-story building measuring approximately 500' by 200'. The building is located directly east of the proposed L'Enfant Plaza group of buildings designed by I. M. Pei, south of the new Federal Office Buildings 10A and 10B, and immediately north of the site of a new Housing and Home Finance Agency building being designed by Marcel Breuer.

The exterior condition of the building is poor but otherwise the structure is sound. Because of its close proximity to these important structures in the Southwest Urban Renewal Area and along Independence Avenue the General Services Administration presented a proposal to the Commission of Fine Arts in 1962 to sheathe the exterior of the building in a pre-cast concret e screen which would hide the existing facade. The members of the Commission had recommended against the proposal because they thought the screen would not reduce the apparent mass of the building or improve its appearance, and that its great cost (more than a million dollars) would not be justified in view of what would be accomplished. The Commission had recommended that the outside surfaces be painted and that any additional changes be confined to those integral with the architecture, such as the window sashes, entranceways, etc.

Under the revised plan a one-story granite veneer would be applied to provide a base for the building on all sides. The base would enclose the existing loading platforms on the D Street elevation and a pattern of windows would be established. All existing sash in the windows above the base would be replaced with aluminum sash and all concrete surfaces painted. The vertical panels between the heavy pilasters would be painted a gray shade in order to cause them to recede. On the roof a

screen would be constructed to enclose the existing penthouses and cooling towers.

The members thought that insufficient material had been submitted regarding the appearance of nearby existing buildings and the proposed plans for new buildings in the immediate area. They agreed that the Public Buildings Service should be requested to present a model of the area to be used in discussing the proposed scheme.

No action was taken pending the meeting on the following day.

c. Bureau of Printing and Engraving - Alterations

Drawings relating to a proposal to modify the fenestration of the Bureau of Printing and Engraving Building located at 14th and C Streets, N.W. were examined. The material represented the results of additional study recommended by the Commission at its meeting on 18 September 1963, at which time the members had expressed strong reservations about a proposal to replace the existing window sash with translucent plastic panels.

As a result of the study it was proposed that thermopane glass be installed on the ends of the four wings of the building along the Fourteenth Street side. Alternating openings in the deep set courts along Fourteenth Street would be filled with either limestone or translucent panels. On the Fifteenth Street facade, which is dominated by an existing colonade, the windows would be entirely reglazed with plastic. On the north and south ends of the building thermopane glass would be used in the articulated end bays and the plastic panels in the remaining bays, which are concealed by adjacent buildings. A mock-up of one of the translucent panels had been installed in one of the courts.

The members thought the revised scheme for changes to the fenestration seemed feasible, but decided to withhold their decision until they had inspected the building and the mock-up on the following day.

2. District of Columbia Government, Department of Buildings & Grounds

District Building - Proposed Location of Flagpoles

The members considered a request for the Commission's advice on a proposal to place two metal flagpoles in the grass strip flanking the main entrance of the District Building on Pennsylvania Avenue at 14th Street. The poles would replace an existing pole located atop the building.

After examining photographs of the building and noting that the existing flagpole on the roof appeared to be poorly located in relation to the facade, the members agreed to approve placing the poles at the ground in front of the building. They noted that their action should not be considered as establishing a precedent for placing flagpoles on

the street in front of public buildings, and that the situation presented in the case of the request for setting a pole in front of the Treasury Building was clearly distinguishable on the facts.

The Chairman was authorized to send a letter approving the proposed location of the flagpoles. EXHIBIT A

3. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, National Capital Region

a. Marion Park, Reservation No. 18, E Street, S.E., Between 4th and 6th Streets-Revised Design

Revised drawings of a development plan for Marion Park were examined. The new drawings consisted of a modification of the design considered at the meeting on 18 October 1963, and an entirely new design.

The members were of the opinion that neither the modified design, in which only change was the elimination of the two rows of columnar trees on the center axis of Fifth Street, S.E., or the new design which showed tree-lined oblique walkways on either side of the center axis, met the Commission's recommendation that the long, narrow space should not be split into two spaces but should be unified.

No final action was taken pending a conference with representatives of the National Park Service on the following day.

b. Bridge over Rock Creek at Calvert Street, N.W.-Proposed Design

The members examined photographs, drawings and a site model showing a proposed design for a bridge to be located on the new Zoo by-pass road leading to a tunnel presently under construction. The Commission had previously examined a proposed design for the bridge at its meeting on 18 September 1963 and had requested more detailed drawings and photographs of the setting and of other bridges constructed in Rock Creek Park.

It was noted that the design - prestressed concrete with masonry covered abutment - was a standard form used throughout Rock Creek Park. The members thought several details of the design could be improved, but agreed the Commission should approve the designs submitted because they followed a pattern already established. They also agreed that the Commission should request a restudy of the standard design by the Park Service prior to the future submission of other bridges.

No final action was taken pending a conference with representatives of the Park Service on the following day.

4. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, National Institutes of Health

Addition to Building 12 - Proposed Design

The members examined material submitted by the architects regarding the design of a proposed addition to Building 12 located on the grounds of the National Institutes of Health in Bethesda, Maryland.

At the meeting on 15 October 1963, when the Commission had last considered this project, the members had requested more information on the nature of plans for future buildings on the National Institutes of Health campus in regard to the location, bulk and height of future buildings.

The material presented consisted of site plans, profile drawings and photographs of neighboring buildings and a scale model of Building 12 and the proposed addition.

Since the addition to the building appeared reasonably sited and its design related to the adjoining building, it was decided to approve it. It was agreed, however, that the Commission should inform the officials of the National Institutes of Health that prior to the submission of future projects a detailed scale model of the campus showing plans for the massing of existing and future buildings, landscaping, provisions for parking, etc., should be presented.

Final action was postponed until the following day.

5. Department of the Treasury, Bureau of the Mint

a. Nevada Centennial Medal - Proposed Design

The Commission was asked to advise on proposed designs for the obverse and reverse of a Nevada Centennial Medal, a National medal commemorating the one hundredth anniversary of the admission of Nevada to statehood. The proposed designs had been approved by the Nevada Centennial Commission as provided by the Act of Congress authorizing the medal.

The obverse consisted of a portrait of a miner, John William Mackay, superimposed upon a map of the State of Nevada and flanked by the dates 1864-1964. On the perimeter were the words "Nevada Centennial."

The reverse consisted of a large number of descriptive and scenic features including the Great Seal of the State of Nevada, a representation of Boulder Dam, a rocket, strands of wheat, sheep and a bull. On the surface of the dam structure were the words "36th State".

The members thought neither of the designs was good, but the obverse might be acceptable if further developed. As to the reverse, they believed it was much too cluttered to ever result in a satisfactory design.

It was suggested all descriptive elements should be eliminated except for the one or two considered to be most important.

The Chairman was authorized to send a letter setting forth the Commission's views. EXHIBIT B

b. Design of Medals - Appointment of Mrs. Saarinen as Sub-Committee to Investigate Procedures

Consideration of the Nevada Centennial Medal led the members into a general discussion of the quality of the designs for National Medals recently submitted to the Commission. They were of the opinion that designs were generally poor and expressed a desire to know how the medals were designed and by whom and what steps could be taken to improve them.

The Chairman, with the concurrence of the other members, asked Mrs. Saarinen to investigate the procedures being followed and to prepare a report with recommendations for consideration by the Commission.

6. Department of Commerce

Official Seal - Proposed Design

The Commission was asked for its advice on a design for a new official seal for the Department of Commerce. The new design would replace the existing seal - a sailing ship and lighthouse on a shield - which is outdated since it symbolizes bureaus no longer a part of the Department.

The proposed design consisted of a gold eagle perched upon a blue and gold shield with a terrestrial globe formed by curving red arrows. A stylized American flag was imposed upon the terrestrial globe. The design was chosen in a competition within the Department.

The members agreed that the old design of the Seal should be revised, but thought the proposed design was too commercial in appearance and lacked the dignity which a seal of a department of the United States should have. They also questioned the propriety of a stylized American flag in a seal.

It was concluded that the Chairman send a letter suggesting that the assistance of a professional be sought in developing the final design. EXHIBIT C

7. District of Columbia Government, Department of Licenses and Inspections

a. Shipstead-Luce Act

(1) Watergate Development - Conference with Architect

Prior to meeting with Professor Luigi Moretti, architect, and representatives of the Watergate Development Corporation, the members reviewed all previous submissions and subsequent recommendations of the Commission on the project and the actions taken by the National Capital Planning Commission, the D.C.Board of Zoning Adjustment and the Zoning Commission. Particular attention was given to the design criteria set forth in an agreement between the architect members of the Commission and Professor Moretti at a special meeting on 18 May 1962, and to the letter dated 17 April 1963 addressed to D.C.Engineer Commissioner Clarke in which the Chairman stated that the Commission believed the buildings in the project were too high.

As a result of this discussion the members agreed that there had never been an official approval of the project by the Commission. It was resolved that Professor Moretti and representatives of the Watergate Development Corporation should be asked to explain what steps had been taken by them to comply with the design criteria agreed upon in 1962.

Professor Moretti and other representatives of the Societe Generale Immobilare and the Watergate Improvements Development Corporation joined the meeting.

Dr. Samaritani, Managing Director and President of the Societe Generale Immobiliare gave a brief statement outlining the course of discussions with the Commission and stated that the architect was prepared to discuss the recommendations made in the Commission's letter of 23 September 1963 and specific design data relating to Building No. 2 for which a building permit had been filed.

Professor Moretti made a statement regarding the matter of the proposed heights of the buildings. He said that photographs of the skyline of the city with drawings of the project superimposed upon them proved that roof levels did not exceed the "average skyline of the City." The photographs were taken from the roof of the Arlington Towers apartment building in Arlington, Virginia.

In regard to the heights of the buildings adjacent to the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway, Professor Moretti showed the members three scale models of the project illustrating alternative proposals to reduce the height of the ends of the building by eliminating one floor and setting back a portion of the top floors of two buildings nearest the Parkway.

The members asked Professor Moretti to explain the steps taken by the Watergate Corporation in response to the Commission's letter of 17 April 1963. Professor Moretti replied that the letter had come to him as a surprise because prior to that there had been a meeting with the Commission at which the building heights and volumes had been approved.

Dr. Samaritani stated the Commission had examined all the models and plans at a meeting on 19 March 1963, and that approval had been

given to everything except some details of the design for Building No. 2, such as the materials, colors, balustrades, etc. which the Commission requested be resubmitted prior to the time a permit application was presented. He stated that a copy of the April 17th letter was sent to the Corporation, but that in the meantime the Board of Zoning Adjustments had approved the plan. Because of the approval by the Board of Zoning Adjustments under Article 75 of the Zoning Regulations of the District of Columbia the Corporation concluded that an agreement had been reached between the Commission of Fine Arts and the Board and that no further action to amend its plans was necessary.

The records of the Commission show that the members discussed a draft of the letter, dated April 17th, at a meeting on 16 April 1963. At that meeting the members reiterated their objections to the height of the buildings and inclusion of the villas in the project. The letter was approved as drafted.

Mr. Julian Green, Assistant Superintendent of Licenses and Permits, was asked to explain what the action of the Board of Zoning Adjustments constituted. Mr. Green stated that under the provisions of Article 75 the Board is required to see that all directives and requirements of other interested agencies have been met before giving approval of a proposed project. He stated that he had been informed by members of the Board that it had concluded the Commission had approved the project in spite of the letter of April 17th.

The Chairman and members of the Commission agreed that regardless of any misunderstanding on the part of the Watergate Corporation and the Board of Zoning Adjustment, the Commission of Fine Arts had never given final approval to plans for the project.

The Commission then discussed the modifications to the heights of some buildings proposed in model form by Professor Moretti. Mr. Bunshaft stated that he did not believe the proposed changes complied with either the six points of the design criteria agreed to in May, 1962 or the recommendations made by the Commission at its meeting on 18 September 1963. He stated that he believed there should be "no cornice line or any plain roof line higher than 140 feet above the water, no line higher than the Lincoln Memorial. This may not comply with zoning, volumes, or any other thing but we are concerned with the esthetics of buildings of a monumental nature related to the city of Washington." The other members concurred in Mr. Bunshaft's statement.

Professor Moretti and the members discussed the possible effects of maintaining the cornice line of all the buildings at 140 feet, or as it was otherwise expressed, at 102 feet above the datum point of 38 feet. The substance of Professor Moretti's remarks was that he would

like to have one or more floors of penthouse apartments as an element to provide a variation and weight to the building. The transcript of this discussion is EXHIBIT D.

In executive session the members agreed that the Commission should recommend that a uniform cornice line of 140 feet above water should be maintained throughout the project with one penthouse level above it. It was further agreed that the open areas in front of the building should be used as a true common space for all residents of the building and, therefore, that all of the villas should be eliminated. The transcript of the discussion in executive session is EXHIBIT E.

When Professor Moretti and others rejoined the meeting the Chairman explained the decision of the Commission concerning the heights of the buildings and the elimination of the villas.

Professor Moretti made a proposal that the architecture of Building 2 be unchanged, and that a stepping-down of penthouse levels from three to zero be permitted on the other buildings.

The Chairman replied that the Commission could not accept the proposal to leave the architecture of Building No. 2 unchanged since that might be the only structure ever erected.

In order that there would be no misunderstanding concerning the recommendations of the Commission, Mr. Bunshaft summarized them by stating that the cornice line of the entire group of buildings could not be more than 140 feet above water; that one penthouse level would be permitted to rise to 150 feet above water; and that the architect could establish a cornice line at any point below 140 feet if he so desired in order to provide more than one penthouse level, provided the 150 foot maximum height was maintained.

The members examined two samples of pre-cast concrete panels with exposed aggregate. It was explained that a dark tone aggregate would be utilized on the lower five floors and a lighter tone on the upper floors. Aluminum window sashes would follow the same color scheme.

The members thought that the lighter material was too white in view of the mass of the buildings in the project and its proximity to the National Cultural Center. A recommendation was made that a warmer tone material should be used such as beige or Roman travertine. The Commission made no recommendation on the question of using two tones, but requested that samples of the two tones in warmer colors be submitted.

Professor Moretti was asked to submit a detailed landscape plan for the project.

The Chairman was authorized to send a letter setting forth the recommendations of the Commission. EXHIBIT F

(2) Building Applications - Appendix 1

Because of the length of the discussion relating to the Watergate Project it was concluded that Appendix 1 of the Order of Business, a report dated 18 November 1963, listing the actions taken on Shipstead-Luce Applications would be mailed to the members for approval or disapproval.

b. Old Georgetown Act, Public Law 808, 81st Congress

Building Applications - Appendix 2

Appendix 2 of the Order of Business, Dated 18 November 1963, a report on the actions taken after the recommendations of the Old Georgetown Board of Architects on applications forwarded for review by the D.C. Department of Licenses and Inspections was sent to the members by mail.

8. English Speaking Union

Sir Winston Churchill Memorial Statue - Proposed Site

Mr. David E. Finley, representing the Washington Branch of the English Speaking Union, met informally with the Commission to discuss a proposed site for a statue of Sir Winston Churchill.

Mr. Finley explained that the bronze statue is to be executed by William McVey, and that it was proposed that it be placed on front of the British Embassy on Massachusetts Avenue so that it will straddle the line dividing British soil and land owned by the District of Columbia. The purpose of positioning the statue in this manner would be to symbolize the fact that Sir Winston was an honorary citizen of this country as well as a subject of England. Mr. Finley showed the members a photograph of the proposed site in front of the circular conference room located on the northern portion of the Embassy grounds. The statue would be 8 or 9 feet high and would be set on a simple granite pedestal three feet high. Evergreen landscaping would be provided as a background.

The Commission thought that the proposed location was not a good choice. They were of the opinion that landscaping would not effectively negate the adverse effect produced if the small bronze statue were placed in front of the dark circular form of the large conference room building. Several alternative locations wer e discussed which would avoid this difficulty.

The Commission's conclusion was that it could not determine the best location without the benefit of detailed material showing the site lines, location of trees, walkways, structures, etc. It was suggested that

professional landscape designers be employed to prepare a fully developed plan showing landscaping and alternative locations for the statue which the Commission could then consider.

The Chairman was authorized to send a letter setting forth the Commission's views. EXHIBIT G

Thereafter, at 5:45 p.m., the meeting was recessed until 9:30 a.m. on the following morning.

Respectfully submitted,

C. L. Martin

C. L. Martin
Counsel

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
19 November 1963

AM
10:15 I. CONVENE, ROOM 7000, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING

II. ADMINISTRATION

1. Approval of Minutes of October, 1963 Meeting

2. Date of Next Meeting:

Executive Session: 17 December 1963, 10:15 a.m.
Open Session: 18 December 1963, 9:30 a.m.

3. Revised Preliminary Budget Request, Fiscal Year 1965

III. SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS-INTERVIEWS

1. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

a. Federal Office Building No. 5 - Revised Design

b. Regional Office Building - Alterations

c. Bureau of Printing and Engraving - Alterations

d. Brooklyn, N.Y. Federal Office Building - Selection of Artist for Mural

2. District of Columbia Government, Department of Buildings & Grounds

Flagpoles to flank Main Entrance of District Building - Proposed Design

3. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, National Capital Region

a. Marion Park, Reservation #18, E St., S.E. between 4th and 6th Sts. - Revised Design

b. Calvert Street Bridge over Rock Creek - Revised Design

4. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, National Institutes of Health

Addition to Building 12 - Proposed Design

5. Department of the Treasury, Bureau of the Mint

Nevada Centennial Medal - Proposed Design

6. Department of Commerce

Official Seal - Proposed Design

7. District of Columbia Government, Department of Licenses & Inspections

a. Shipstead-Luce Act

2:30 p.m. (1) Watergate Development - Conference with Luigi Moretti, architect, and other representatives of the project

(2) S.L. 64-37, Apartment House, 2700 Adams Mill Road, N.W.

(3) Building Applications - Appendix 1

b. Old Georgetown Act

(1) Building Applications - Appendix 2

(2) O.G. 64-138, New Residence, 3400 Reservoir Road, N.W.

8. English Speaking Union

Winston Churchill Memorial Statue - Proposed Site

9. D.C. Department of Highways and Traffic

Street Widening Program

2 December 1963

Dear General Duke:

The plan to substitute two flagpoles flanking the principal entrance to the District Building for the one currently on the roof was approved by the Commission at its November meeting.

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Brigadier General Charles M. Duke
Engineer Commissioner for the
District of Columbia
District Building
Washington, D. C. 20004

EXHIBIT A

21 November 1963

Dear Miss Adams:

The Commission of Fine Arts considers that the designs for the obverse and reverse of the Nevada Centennial Medal lack sufficient artistic merit for production as a National Medal. The conception of the design for the obverse could possibly be developed to a point where it would be acceptable, but the reverse is overloaded with so many descriptive and scenic features, including the State Seal, that it would be impossible to produce a satisfactory design without eliminating all but one or two of the most important.

A fresh concept in designing National Medals is mandatory. There are many talented sculptors and designers to call upon for this work.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Honorable Eva Adams
Director
Bureau of the Mint
Treasury Department
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT B

21 November 1963

Dear Herbie:

The Commission of Fine Arts understands your desire to modernize the seal of the Department of Commerce.

The members of the Commission consider, however, that the design which was chosen in competition should be considered a starting point for the design of a new seal. It is obvious that the assistance of a professional designer or sculptor is necessary to achieve the quality suitable for your Department.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Honorable Herbert W. Klotz
The Assistant Secretary of Commerce
Washington 25, D. C.

EXHIBIT C

PROFESSOR MORETTI: I remember in the first recommendations of Fine Arts, I remember very distinctly the most important point was to extend the park and have open spaces between the buildings. Well, Mr. Sasaki mentioned at the time having maximum open space and landscaping available The rsult you see here was naturally based not on just negotiations but as an equilibrium between the two requirements. One was the initial requirements to be feasible, that is square footage and size; second, of this opening, the maximum possible openness and landscaping and between the two, I arrived at this solution.

Also I am satisfied that this could be a contribution to Washington because I feel I wouldn't like to come here from abroad and present something I don't believe in. My signature is also worth something.

I believe that over that line we discussed, this so-called cornice line or 140 foot line, I'd like to have certain weight, even if it's not too much -- but it is necessar I would also like to point out in my opinion splitting the building in two, having that recessed line or belt line, could not be handled satisfactorily on the lower building. We'd have to rework it.

MR. BUNSHAFT: This is a personal negotiation.

9/63

Exhibit D

This (indicating) is 102 feet or 140, this line here. Above that you have two floors of, shall we say, penthouses, in some cases; and in others, three. I think in the first place, the concept of this building floating, the concept of this notch is very good, very nice. I think esthetically as well as height, I think these two floors are not too handsome a proportion and I'd suggest to the Commission 102 feet for that line over the whole thing and one floor of, shall we call this penthouses? One floor and if you want to leave those lumps, all right; but not three or two.

In other words, I think it would be better proportion, anyhow, and it would then make it about 150 or 149 feet above the water level, and carry out the corners.

That is my personal feeling. There are other architects on this Commission and we will have to talk about this privately. I am just throwing this out as a thought.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: A very interesting idea.

MRS. SAARINEN: I wonder, eliminating the front things, allowing a variation of one or two floors on the back ones -- I think that would be more in keeping with Professor Moretti's. I don't think that Gordon heard his defense of why he wanted the things on top.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I am not objecting to the things on the top. I am saying you can take this band -- that cornice line

which in my opinion has to be strong throughout the whole project.

MRS. SAARINEN: Excuse me. He was explaining, if I understand it correctly, his architectural thinking that he wanted to have the one-, two-, and three-variation floors on the top because he felt it necessary to hold them down. What I'm wondering is, if this is true and he believes they should have this variation, perhaps it would be possible to take them off the front buildings completely and have one or two stories on the back ones, which is basically what you are suggesting, only in the back.

You are saying that would still be too high?

MR. WARNECEK: Visually, isn't the most important visual experience along the Potomac River and what you see on the Potomac in relation to buildings against it? Here you'll have a lot of other building masses moving into it.

CHAIRMAN WALTON; It is across the river and the two angles this way (indicating) which is all we talk about, really.

MR. WARNECKE: This is the most sensitive area along the Potomac. Although the height of the Lincoln Memorial is the height you are concerned with, this should be equal, too. The Lincoln Memorial is an infinitely smaller building, and this thing is tremendous there to there (indicating). Across the river are these great freeways which bring you into the city, and it's important, Gordon, how this thing looks from across

there, too.

MRS. SAARINEN: That is why I was suggesting building up.

MR. WARNECKE: Unfortunately, we wish we had a model of the Cultural Center.

MR. BUNSHAFT: It's not built yet. This is going to be built, but that is in somebody's head.

I really can't see, personally, how you can step this design down. I really don't. But let's say you keep that 102-foot line all through the whole thing, and then you said you could stack the equivalent of one-floor penthouses over the whole thing, you can stack it two levels here, one here, and zero here (indicating), if you want to. But the equivalent of one-floor penthouses.

MRS. SAARINEN: That's right. Preferably keeping it to the back and not on the front building.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I don't see how you can step this thing down (indicating).

MRS. SAARINEN: You can't.

MR. KELLY: You might step it down by taking out a whole story below.

MRS. SAARINEN: But you'd spoil the proportion.

MR. KELLY; From the front you have five and sometimes six stories from that break.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Mr. Moretti wants to say something.

PROFESSOR MORETTI: I'd like to talk as architect to architect, Mr. Bunshaft. I do not quite agree that a cut of that sort, a lowering, would be satisfactory.

MR. BUNSHAFT: The second suggestion of taking the equivalent of one floor and making it two here and one here (indicating).

MR. KELLY: I think we probably should not go any further with this kind of talk, because we will have the same kind of misunderstanding we had before. What did we talk about and what did we agree on?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I think this may be a useful line, which Gordon is pursuing.

PROFESSOR MORETTI: If this section is handled in such a way that the first penthouse completely disappears, well, I need that weight on top of the upper part. The two parts of the building are one to one, and you have to hold that down with a weight.

MR. KELLY: But the two parts could be four four instead of five five.

PROFESSOR MORETTI: It is five six, actually. Six five.

MR. KELLY: Except in the front where it is six six or six seven.

MR. WARNECKE: Would you point out exactly where you would be in compliance with our letter of the 23rd? Where would 90 feet be on this model and then what would we do with this (indicating).

MR. BUNSHAFT: Let me show you something. This is 140 here (indicating). To get down to 90, you have to take this whole thing out.

MR. WARNECKE: That's what I want to know.

MR. BUNSHAFT: You see, right here (indicating) it is 140 and you take off 20 feet -- this here is 120 feet above water -- no, it's 120 feet above this (indicating), so if you have to get down to 90, you take off three floors. You would be down to here (indicating).

MR. WARNECKE: Well, for the benefit of the Commission, we felt esthetically along the river we'd have a building about this high from this part to here (indicating), 90 feet, which could gradually step up to 130 feet at this high point (indicating). I believe this is what we said in our letter.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think we must argue amongst ourselves.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Well, we are.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think with very strong curved forms and these going back to also stagger this up would be awful. I think where the land is sloping and you have these very strong forms you have to have some line to kind of hold it together.

You see, if this were made as a low element and this were made as a high element (indicating), you could justify it but to have little step-backs, I can't see it. Somewhere you have to have a horizontal plane in it.

MR. KELLY: I agree with you. Gordon, if you step around here, you would see the number of tiers on this "wedding cake."

MR. BUNSHAFT: What I find ugly, I'm not talking volume, is this (indicating). It's not a top because it has no deep shadows to give a top to the building. You could have five of these and still not give a top to the building. This things melts into the sky. But that is a personal eccentricity. I think the weakest things is -- we have all of these little lumps. Even the penthous ought to be a strong line, in my feeling. That is a matter of personal design feeling.

PROFESSOR MORETTI: If I may point out, that also has a reason. At the time of the discussion, it was said the building mass being too high should have something that disappears.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Well, I can't justify what some previous architect said. All I can do is talk as I feel, and the other architects talk as they feel. In the end, we have to talk together.

MRS. SAARINEN: What was the objection to your suggestion of maintaining the strong cornice line -- even if we were willing to maintain the cornice line, what was their reaction to the suggestion of taking the equivalent of one story of penhouse and distributing it as they wished, stepping up toward the back?

MR. BUNSHAFT: What would your feeling be if we said you could maintain that line right there, 140 feet above the water, and that (indicating), and take the equivalent of one whole floor of penthouse, this equivalent area over the whole project, and if you want to do it that way or if you want to have it one and two, if you want to play around with the design, what would you feel about that?

MRS. SAARINEN: Building it up toward the back, keeping it lower on the front?

MR. BUNSHAFT: Well, if they want to do it only.

MR. SALGO: I can talk only from my own personal impression.

MR. BUNSHAFT: That is what we are all doing here.

MR. SALGO: No, but in effect you realize you are suggesting something we did not seriously consider answering directly. May I ask Mrs. Saarinen in the same idea as she has just announced, to really conserve this somewhat amphitheatrical expression of the land, which slopes down in a curve toward the

water, would there be anything wrong in maintaining the line as Mr. Bunshaft just suggested, reduce it to one floor here (indicating), for instance, and maybe either one of the two buildings -- my impression would be not both but one, and stepping it up here to two (indicating), which probably would give us about an economical limit?

To express myself even more concretly, taking Mr. Bunshaft's suggestion, I add to it a possible second floor maybe more expressed, better expressed, as you suggested, if that fits with Professor Moretti's ideas -- here (indicating)-- probably none existing here (indicating) -- and in either one of the two buildings, but here having a relatively strong higher line to make some meaning when you step down.

MRS. SAARINEN: Is he bargaining for more--

MR. BUNSHAFT: We are now getting down to nickels and dimes.

MR. WARNECKE: No, you're not, really, at all. You know the Planning Commission is studying this business of having higher buildings, and they encourage them to do this. The thing I notice in Washington is the buildings which go out substantially above the trees are so noticeable and stand out so much that I think that's our visual three-dimension concern. I'd prefer even seeing a little denser thing, somehow, and keep this a little lower. I am not in concurrence with putting these big things up there and having to look at them.

MR. KELLY: Especially if they are relatively high.

MR. WARNECKE: I think the trees eventually are going up this high (indicating). Is there any way of increasing density?

MR. KELLY: There's no tower here (indicating).

MRS. SAARINEN: I think that is a blessing.

MR. KELLY; Mr. Chairman, I think we've gone about as far as we can go.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We have, just about.

MR. WARNECKE: Have you only done working drawings of this?

MR. GRAFF: Yes. Each of them is designed in the 32nd scale.

MR. SALGO: To be able to prepare working drawings for this building -- it's really not only this building but all this area (indicating) -- we also had to prepare drawings and studies for all the underground area, the foundation for all the buildings because the underground is for traffic flow. In effect you must realize that in the last three years we did about three-quarters of the total planning that we presented for building purposes; only this one from our schedule of operation and market absorption. Plans are very substantially advanced.

MR. KELLY: Do the underground studies include the villas?

MR. SALGO: They do include the villas, even the private parking for the villas.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: But you say those are in doubt from your own point of view?

MR. SALGO: They are in doubt as far as their economic desirability goes, and they were put in doubt by the Fine Arts Commission as far as detraction of common space in favor of private space; and we tried there, also, a compromise. I'm the first to admit it. We reduced it from 20 villas to 13 and our thinking now is, we have it on the plans, we try to see them built but if we find six months from now that people are not breaking the doors down for them, we may completely eliminate them.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Mr. Bunshaft?

MR. BUNSHAFT: I wonder if we could meet for a while ourselves and then call them back?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Would you be willing to retire briefly, and allow us to converse?

(Professor Moretti and his group withdrew from the Conference Room.)

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Well, team.

Mr. Sasaki?

MR. SASAKI: I think, as a matter of procedure, I would suggest we listen to Mr. Bunshaft's idea because he has a precise recommendation.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: The most precise anybody has come up with.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Well, the darn thing is we're here with this project. If we really cut it down, as we are talking, they can't build it economically and it's a big project and evidently the volume is allowed.

Frankly, I'd rather see big open spaces, rather than have them go through some of the stuff we're threatened with. I think this 140 feet is not bad. This is a big project. I don't care if it is broken up into ten buildings, it's a big project and is going to be this mass.

MR. KELLY: The volume's allowed because they have taken over a whole lot of city streets granted to them under this general design thing. If they had the original thing and didn't get the release of the city streets, they could not have anything like this.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Well, that's how you get a big project.

MRS. SAARINEN: Well, they have them. It's accomplished.

MR. BUNSHAFT: They just bought land from the city, and it is now their land.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Bought it? It was granted. It's a gift.

MR. WARNECKE: They got it for nothing?

Exhibit E

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Absolutely.

Are you unhappy?

MR. KELLY: I just don't think we should start compromising as far as Gordon was tending to, before we went into executive session.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I am just speaking for myself. I would establish a standard of not going above 150 feet on any building in the city. The river does not bother me in the slightest. If you had about 5% of the project along the edge. Also if I were the architect for it, I would fight for a straight cornice line, especially with all these curves. If you start setting them down and curving, it would be an awful mess. If I were alone, I'd say I would agree to 140 feet above water level and one major penthouse floor, the equivalent of it, and if they wanted to have no penthouse at one end and two on part of something else, I would agree to it, depending on their resubmission. I would not approve it as a carte blanche and I would cut all the housing out from here (indicating) and make this for the use of the tenants.

MR. SASAKI: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I may express an idea here. I think the notion of 140 is a good one to work from because they are at 160, roughly, at the present time. That means cutting off only two. It means cutting off only these two top penthouses. Then we'd have this cornice and one penthouse.

I would almost insist we stop it there. I think the elevator towers and all that junk gives you the variety at the top. I think these are the esthetic considerations we could insist on.

My own feeling in appraising the thing is they would go along with it, but if we reduce it to 90, we are in a different economic --

MRS. SAARINEN: In other words, you are saying 140 and one penthouse level.

MR. BUNSHAFT: The penthouse is above that. This is 102 here (indicating) plus 38, 140.

MRS. SAARINEN: 140 plus one penthouse level. Period. I think that is better than the possibility of the two.

MR. KELLY: Is one of these receding penthouses the kind you want?

MR. BUNSHAFT: I don't care what kind it is.

MR. SASAKI: If you leave it open, they will come and say they did this. If we insisted on this and permitted this kind of variation (indicating), there would be enough variety.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think this vertical pile of stuff is awful. This thing with zebra stripes.

MRS. SAARINEN: What is that for?

MR. ATHERTON: It is an office building.

MR. SASAKI: And then he wouldn't have to change his drawings much at all. He could proceed with this

building and just take off this penthouse. That is a modest request.

MR. KELLY: You are averaging on one floor?

MR. BUNSHAFT: Taking out two floors in some places. What we are really saying is about 140 feet plus the penthouse.

MR. KELLY: You are asking them to lose one rentable floor.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Plus two in a couple places.

MR. KELLY: No, I mean it averages out to one, because it is down to zero over here in the corner.

MRS.SAARINEN: I think that's a far simpler directive, with a chance of getting it followed.

MR. BUNSHAFT: If they happen to be telling the truth, that 2 million and some square feet, they've done a little cutting.

MR. SASAKI: We shouldn't really worry too much about their economics because they can reduce the cost of the detailing of the thing to meet the economics within reason, but if we cut out too much, then they can't; so I think if we permit them one penthouse, the notion of a penthouse rental, I think, is still there. Then I think we would get generally the effect and mass we want, and not penalize them too much. It may help the building some because then they can cut some of the balconies and junk out of there, to reduce their overall cost.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: A real challenge.

MRS. SAARINEN: I'd say we should hold very firmly to these things and be fairly lenient on the detail, which we will never be able to do anything about anyway.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think we should express that it seems unnecessarily complicated, and they should simplify it.

MR. SASAKI: I think just tell them this is what we will approve or we recommend; that is what we'll approve.

MR. KELLY: They can have 102 feet plus one penthouse. They don't have to take the penthouse off the whole thing.

MR. BUNSHAFT: They can't put two penthouses any place. They can have one over the whole.

MR. SASAKI: We should get this one issue settled.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: What if they just shake their heads and say no?

MRS. SAARINEN: Then we don't approve it. We wish to see the revised model, don't we?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: The revised model.

MR. WARNECKE: What do the minutes say of that meeting?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: The minutes of that meeting are shocking. They prove their point completely. Absolutely.

MR..SASAKI: No, I don't think so.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Well, if it were any good, I would have read it.

MR. SASAKI: It says the members liked the general concept of the plan. That's the point I was trying to make. Also the kind of discussion that came up here, you had a great variety of points of view there, too, but I think there was unanimity in concern with height and mass.

MRS. SAARINEN: But it doesn't sound at all like the April 17 letter.

MR. SASAKI: No. It says, "The Commission was concerned that the details of the buildings," and so forth. So I don't think this really -- that's exactly what we said today, that we liked the general spirit.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: But it is not good enough.

MR. SASAKI: No, it isn't.

MRS. SAARINEN: We must be very careful when we give this to the press to stress the 140 because of the Lincoln thing, and that we're going to stick to that, and so on.

MR. WARNECKE: You were talking about 140 feet above water level, Gordon. When you have a project over here that is 70 feet above water level further on, what are you going to do with that? Any project that faces on the Potomac?

MR. BUNSHAFT: As far as I am concerned, anything close to the Lincoln Memorial would not go higher than 140,

whether it's 70 foot above the water or not. I think this is quite close to the Lincoln Memorial.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: There aren't going to be other things coming up on this issue.

MRS. SAARINEN: What I meant was when it is stated to the press, we should stress the 140 and add "plus one penthouse story." The strongness of the 140 line as opposed to the weakness of the penthouse thing must be made clear; otherwise, it sounds like we are just really allowing 150 or something.

MR. SASAKI: I think the 140 is the cornice line of the Lincoln Memorial and also has a penthouse.

MR. ATHERTON: The 140 is the absolute top of it.

MR. KELLY: The cornice is 120, is it?

MR. ATHERTON; I think 110 or 120.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: That middle thing is terribly high in proportion.

MR. WARNECKE: You are just basically tinkering with this.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We are reducing it.

MRS. SAARINEN: But what more can you do at this point? They are going to scream at that.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Are we going to approve this with a reduction of ten feet? Isn't that essentially wha t

we're suggesting?

MR. WARNECKE: I would rather propose to see if you can't negotiate a little lower and then have to come up.

MRS. SAARINEN: I don't think we should put ourselves in the position of negotiating. I think we should have an esthetic opinion and state it. I don't think we should bargain with them.

MR. KELLY: What is wrong with 140 feet as the dead top?

MRS. SAARINEN: I think you are stronger to face reality, if it's true they have reduced it. Twenty per cent is a lot, and I don't think that penthouse is going to be very noticeable or visible,one floor of it.

MR. ROSZAK: Actually if you take one floor off, you are not changing the appearance of this -- not a whit. I think we should put this on principle. Otherwise, it will sound like carping, and I think it would be a small, infinitesimal detail for the press --

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Here's the strength of using the 140 foot yardstrick: The Lincoln Memorial.

MR. SASAKI: It is well known.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Absolute; and everyone will understand this symbolism.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think we are in a problem here of not really having got control over this. The previous

regime diddled around with this over a year, and God knows what they agreed. We are sitting here in a rather difficult position. The papers say that yes, they should do something; and these fellows didn't. Evidently, this meeting he refers to, I think he's telling the truth from what the minutes say.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: So do I.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Also, there is a language difficulty. If we were looking at this thing for the first time, I think we'd really say, "Look fellows, you just can't build this thing that high. The top of it should be 130 feet, including all the little houses," or something like that, you know.

Frankly, also, if you look from this side where you see a mass runing about 1500 feet, well, it's 130, 150 or 160 -- it doesn't make the slightest bit of difference -- or even 100.

MR. KELLY: I think we ought to consider, as hard as we can, suppose you said to take out two stories from the building, instead of one; take it out any way they want. Leave it to Moretti to decide where he is taking it out. All of the misunderstanding notwithstanding, you say that if they came in, in the first place, with this you'd say we would have said that. If all they did was take out two standard floors from the 13, this requires very little architectural problem. All you have is the financing problem.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: All right. Where do we stand? Is the Commission willing to have Gordon propose to them we use the

140 foot?

MR. BUNSHAFT: Above water for the cornice line, and one penthouse -- and make that useful park in the middle.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Any objections to this as our proposal to them?

MR. KELLY: I would rather have 140 feet top.

MR. WARNECKE: I would, too.

MRS. SAARINEN: I don't think you can. You mean, let them dispose of it the way they want to?

MR. WARNECKE: Two more floors on the Mall -- those buildings across from the Archives prove the point -- two or three more floors stand up like a sore thumb.

MRS. SAARINEN: Am I correct in understanding that your proposal is 140 feet absolute tops, so you could do anything you want underneath it? Would that be the top of this kind of thing?

MR. BUNSHAFT: We are talking about 10 feet difference here.

MR. KELLY: It is 20 feet difference to them, 10 feet between us. It comes out to 260,000 square feet of rentable space. Gordon, I wouldn't go along with 140 feet if they ended up with three penthouses.

MR. WARNECKE: We didn't say that.

MRS. SAARINEN: But they could, if you state it that way. They could. If you give them that directive and tell

them they can do anything within it, as long as it's not over 140 feet, they could decide penthouses rent for more, they can charge more for penthouses.

MR. KELLY: Then all they'd have to do is take out one standard floor from above and below the belt.

MR. ROSZAK: Two floors.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Yes.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think this 140 and one penthouse is something they can stomach. I think the other would be a tough problem.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I would like to propose something to them we thought they would accept. We've been in it for years. It is a big civic issue which grows bigger all the time. We can't ignore the fact we live in a political situation.

MR. KELLY: Mr. Chairman, you have three votes --

MR. SASAKI: I vote with Gordon.

MRS. SAARINEN: I'm with Gordon, too. I think it is realistic and I don't think you will improve it that much by your idea, and you would not get them to agree to it. I think we can hold firm to this thing, which seems a more reasonable proposal. If we were starting from scratch, I would argue entirely differently.

MR. ROSZAK: I am for that. I think that is something

which will appeal to them, and I think they will work their way out.

MR. SASAKI: In fairness, again, to the architects, shouldn't we express some notion about the detail?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I would think so, too, but after we make this pitch, in sequence.

MR. KELLY: We have two points, then: The height generally and the open space left open; is this right?

MR. BUNSHAFT: And we are saying we do want to be involved a little in what this material is.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: They have to, anyway, and they are perfectly aware of it. I would like you to present our position when they come in.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think you ought to.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I can't do it as well, really, because I don't understand it so well.

MR. BUNSHAFT: It is very simply that we are just saying 140 feet above water level for the cornice line, plus one penthouse. 140 feet above water. Let's stick to that.

MR. KELLY: We don't want to give anybody the impression Mr. Bunshaft is deciding it because the pressure would be put on him.

(At this point, Professor Moretti and his group returned to the Conference Room.)

20 November 1963

Dear Mr. Green:

I am returning to you the Watergate Town apartment project, Phase 1, application with the disapproval of the Fine Arts Commission.

I know that you were present at our long meeting on November 19 with the representatives of the Watergate Development and the architect, Luigi Moretti, but for the record I want to set down for you the burden of that meeting. The Commission told the Watergate developers that they would act favorably on a future design with a cornice line 140' above water level, the same height as the Lincoln Memorial, and in addition would allow one penthouse story above the cornice. The Commission felt it extremely important, as a matter of public policy, that nothing directly on the river in this area rise higher than the Lincoln Memorial. I do not need to point out the great symbolic importance of this memorial to our entire nation.

Our meeting with the Watergate developers was a friendly one and I hope useful to all concerned. We have shown our sympathy with their position by making considerable concessions. I hope that they proceed along these lines.

In addition, the Commission expressed opposition to the so-called villas that would occupy most of the open space in the complex of buildings and suggested that when they make a new submission the exterior building materials be a warmer shade of aggregate.

Yours truely,

William Walton
Chairman

Mr. Julian P. Green
Assistant Superintendent of
Licenses and Permits
District Building
Washington 4, D.C.

cc: Brigadier General Duke

21 November 1963

Dear Mr. Mitener:

Mr. David Finley made an informal presentation to the Fine Arts Commission on November 19 concerning the English Speaking Union's plan to put a statue of Sir Winston Churchill near the British Embassy.

The Commission felt that the plan had not been prepared fully enough for any positive action. Placing the statue astride an invisible line between U.S. and British territory is hardly the way to approach the matter as far as this Commission is concerned. We recommend the retention of professional landscape designers to prepare a plan for the entire area, incorporating a statue at the spot where it will relate best to the existing building and trees. When such a plan has been developed we will be happy to consider it.

The Commission also wishes the English Speaking Union well in its plan to memorialize Sir Winston.

With best wishes,

William Walton
Chairman

Mr. Bradford Mitener
Chairman
Washington Branch of the English
Speaking Union
2131 S Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

Copy to: Mr. David E. Finley
Miss Kay Halle

EXHIBIT 6

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT APPLICATIONS

NOV 6 1963

NO SL 64-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
51	2700 Virginia Ave., NW Watergate Realty Co.	Rev. of SL 64-41. 2 s-f signs. One 12 sq-ft. One 5 sq-ft. 1 sign with blue indiv. ltrs. 1 sign with white ltrs.
ACTION: App'd., 10/21/63.		
52	2161 P St., NW Fireplace Restaurant	Erect 1 canvas canopy on 22nd St. entr. with fixed iron frames & posts. White. Similar to exist. structure.
ACTION: Ret'd. for clarification of other related awning structures app'd. in application SL 2619, dtd. 6/18/63, 10/31/63.		
53	201-03-05 D St., NE 201 Associates	Rev. of SL 64-46. Drawing showing location of brick garden wall in relation to public space.
ACTION: Site inspection revealed proposed brick garden walls are already constructed in public space. There seems to be no objection in this particular case, as the walls merely join exist. bays of a limited projection. This action, however, should not be construed as a precedent for the approval of future applications of a similar nature, 10/31/63.		
54	522-21st St., NW O. T. Carr, Jr. et al	Erect 10-story apt. bldg.
ACTION: App'd., as revised, 11/1/63.		
55	2161 P St., NW Fireplace Restaurant	1 24=sq-ft sign.
ACTION: App'd., provided sign matches that over entr. on "P" St., & is centered immediately above showwindow on 22nd St. elevation, 10/31/63.		

APPENDIX I

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT APPLICATIONS 11/20/63

NO SL 64-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
56	2030 F St., NW O. T. Carr, Jr., et al	Rev. of SL 64-34. 10-story apt. bldg.
ACTION: App'd. as revised. Request sample of exterior brick for review, 11/12/63.		
57	2500 Calvert St., NW Shoreham Hotel	1-story, 1-rm. addn. to snack bar.
ACTION: App'd., 11/12/63.		
58	8000 West Beach Dr., NW Thos. Kern	Enclose exist. open porch & remove 1 non-bearing wall.
ACTION: App'd., 11/5/63.		
59	1639 H St., NW Albany Pharmacy Drug, Inc.	Rev. of SL 64-47. 2 s-f signs. 10½ sq-ft each. To replace exist. signs. Stainless steel ltrs. gray panel, white neon tubing inside. 1 sign on 17th St. 1 sign on H St.
ACTION: App'd., provided bckgd. panel of sign is painted to match color of bldg., 11/12/63.		
62	2401 Calvert St., NW Wm. Magazine et al (Hotel)	1 s-f tempo. constr. sign. 10.7 sq-ft. Cream ltrs. on terra cotta bckgd.
ACTION: App'd. as tempo. constr. sign, 11/14/63.		
63	2228 Cathedral Ave., NW Mr & Mrs Chas. W. Putnam	Remove exist. tin shed garage (12x16') & install carport with conc. slab fl. (15x22') in same location.
ACTION: App'd., 11/14/63.		

APPENDIX 1

NO SL 64-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
64	307 H St., NW Frederick Richman	Move exist. showwindow back to bldg. line & remodel. Replace front with similar brick. New entr. door & display window.
ACTION:	Ret'd. for determination as to jurisdiction of the Commission of Fine Arts, 11/18/63.	
66	2161 P St., NW Fireplace Restaurant	Erect tempo. removable storm vestibule to be used in winter months of wood & glass in accordance with exist. decor.
ACTION:	App'd., 11/18/63.	
61	2500 Virginia Ave., NW Watergate Realty Co.	14-story concrete apt. bldg. (Bldg. #2).
ACTION:	Disap'd. See accompanying ltr., 11/20/63.	

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS NOV 6 1963

NO OG 64-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
108	3306 "O" St., NW Georgetown University	Install exterior stairs in rear of dwelling, from porch to ground level.
ACTION: Recom'd., 10/29/63.		
115	1655 Avon Pl., NW General Gray	Install 3 exterior coach lamps on front entr. of bldg. 2 lights at 1st fl. level. 1 at basement level.
ACTION: Recom'd., 10/29/63.		
116	3403 M St., NW Edmund Dreyfuss	Renovate 1st fl. front.
ACTION: Recom'd., provided following changes are incorporated into design. Brick veneer throughout; shift entrances to left; lower sill of window & modify lights of door, all as shown on attached sketch. Request subm. of sketch showing revisions, 10/29/63.		
118	3310 R St., NW Miss Louise McNutt	Addn. to part of 2nd fl. front.
ACTION: Recom'd., 10/29/63.		
119	3115 P St., NW Presbyterian Cong. in Georgetown	1 s-f, 18 sq-ft sign. V-cut carved ltrs. in exist. limestone wall.
ACTION: Recom'd., 10/29/63.		
120	1640 Wisc. Ave., NW Geo. Lincoln Assoc. Interiors	Replace exist. bronze plaque to left of front door with new. 3 s-f signs over showwindow. Gold ltrs., black bckgd. Same style as photo.
ACTION: Recom'd., provided style of ltrs. matches exist. sign, 10/29/63.		

APPENDIX 2

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS (Continued)

NOV 6 1963

NO OG 64-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
121	2901 M St., NW Manhattan Auto	1 d-f sign, 24 sq-ft, to be placed on exist. pole. 12 sq-ft each face. Black ltrs. white bckgd.

ACTION: Not recom'd: text of sign limited to identification of business, omitting advertising of products & insignia. Ltrs. to be vertical. Also recom. a lower & better-designed support for sign, NOV 6 1963

122	2819 M St., NW Manhattan Auto	1 s-f, 20 sq-ft sign. Gray, white & black. Plastic. Illuminated.

ACTION: Not recom'd. Sign to have individual opaque-faced, backlighted ltrs. with no exposed source of illumination. Ltrs. to be vertical, & appropriately spaced in central panel on frieze. Accurate scale drawing of sign in relation to facade is requested, NOV 6 1963

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS

NOV 1 3 1963

NO OG 64-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
114	1525-29th St., NW Alice R. Addison	Raze in entirety 2-story frame & stucco single family detached residence.
ACTION: Recom'd. No arch'l. or historical characteristics are discernible in this bldg. that would preclude issuing a permitto raze it, 11/6/63.		
117	2831 M St., NW Cities Service Oil Co.	Two 2-light fixtures on each 18' high pole on private driveway.
ACTION: Ret'd. for more inf. re type of poles, & location, & dimensions of lamp, 11/5/63.		
123	3341 Prospect Ave., NW John Taylor	7' & 3' high chain link fence entirely upon land of owner.
ACTION: No obj. to chain-link fence since it is not visible from public space. However suggest that use of cedar sapling or other wood fence would be more appropriate from point of view of neighboring properties, 11/5/63.		
124	1673-34th St., NW Southampton Invest. Corp.	Remodel house per accompanying blueprints.
ACTION: Proposed modifications to revised side elevation incl. new roof line at end gable & add'l. 2nd-story window are recom'd. provided that entr. doorway is revised according to design app'd. under OG 64-86, 11/5/63.		
125	2731 M St., NW E. A. Audette (Commercial)	4 exterior lamps.
ACTION: Recom'd., 11/5/63.		
127	2622 P St., NW Mrs. Elsie Shepard	Repair showwindow with brick.
ACTION: Recom'd., provided that the bricks be standard size & match color of bldg., 11/5/63.		
128	1407-28th St., NW Mr. Syphax W. Burnett	6' high wood stockade fence.
ACTION: Recom'd., 11/5/63.		

NOV 1 3 1963

NO OG 64-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
129	3077 M St., NW Food Mart	1 s-f, 14 sq-ft sign. Gothic Future ltrs., baked black finish.

ACTION: Ret'd. for clarification of arch'l. treatment to frieze over showwindow. Suggest that black carrara glass be surfaced with white metal or wood frieze of classical design, terminating brick veneer immediately at line of awning attachment. Also suggest ltrs. of sign be reduced to 12" in height. Submit drawing showing relation of sign to bldg., 11/5/63.

130	3057 M St., NW Red Coach Inn	1 s-f, 12.5 sq-ft sign. 10" high sawed aluminum ltrs. 3/8" thick, alumilite finish.

ACTION: Recom'd. for location centered above frieze over entranceway & below 2nd-story window, 11/5/63.

131	3000 M St., NW Sinclair Refining Co.	Remove exist. identif. sign & replace with 1 d-f, 25 sq-ft each face sign, on pole. Red ltrs., white bckgd.

ACTION: Recom'd., provided that design of sign & supporting elements be simplified according to attached sketch. Also recom. that all unauthorized advertising on bldg. & site be removed prior to the issuance of a permit for this sign, 11/5/63.

133	3403 M St., NW Mac's Pipe & Drum Cafe	Renovate 1st fl. as per plans.

ACTION: Recom'd. as revised on drawings dtd. Revised 11/1/63, 11/5/63.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS

OCT 3 0 1963

NO OG 64- Inf.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
95	2718 Olive Ave., NW J. I. & G. B. Thompson	2 dormer windows rear of house-roof. 2 dormers plus long window-raising roof between dormers to elevation of roof top.

ACTION: No obj. to proposed changes on rear elevation. Recom. 3 individual dormers equally spaced on front elevation; lights in sash to match those of 1st & 2nd fl. windows, 10/22/63.

96	3412 Prospect St., NW M.C. & C. Ryan	Replace steps & wood rail with iron steps & ornamental w. i. rail, & add 2 supporting w. i. columns on base for extra supp't.

ACTION: Recom'd., 10/22/63.

97	3221 Reservoir Rd., NW Stuart Ayers	Replace exist. porch with new. Replace window with 6/9 d-h sash. New wood frame around entr. doorway. Shutters on front. 2nd fl. bedrm. addn. on rear of bldg.

ACTION: Recom'd. Suggest that bottom stair rail be omitted & that balusters be attached directly to treads on entr. steps, 10/22/63.

98	3146 M St., NW New Look Fashion Wigs, Inc.	1 s-f, 18 sq-ft wood sign. Black ltrs. on white bckgd.

ACTION: Not recom'd. Revise text of sign using classical ltrs. of a uniform height of 8". Also request determination of exist. sign area on facade, total of which should not exceed 25 sq-ft together with new sign.

OCT 3 0 1963

99	1222-29th St., NW H. J. Schaliski	Replacing 2 carriage lanterns on front of dwelling & 1 carriage lantern in garden--rear of dwelling. NOTE: All lanterns are identical except size.

ACTION: Recom'd., 10/22/63.

100	1511 Wisc. Ave., NW Per of Georgetown	Rev. of OG 64-81. Resubm. of elevations & details of canopy previously considered.

ACTION: Recom'd. as revised, 10/14/63.

NO OG 64-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
101	3312 Volta Pl., NW Mr. A. R. Evans ACTION: Recom'd., 10/14/63.	Replace dangerous cast iron steps with new brick steps matching exist. bldgs. in block. Steps ext. 4'-6" beyond bldg. line
102	1014 Wisc. Ave., NW Maloney Concrete Co. ACTION: Recom'd., 10/24/63.	Rev. of Inf. OG 64-6. Additions & alterations.
103	3410 N St., NW W.H. & V.M. Tanzer ACTION: Recom'd. as revised, 10/18/63.	Rev. to OG 64-89. Remove exist. entr. Install new entr. at side.
104	1050-31st St., NW Robert Tillman ACTION: Recom'd. as revised, 10/22/63.	Rev. of OG 64-76. 1 s-f sign. 10.12 sq-ft. Bronze plaque, 4" high black metal ltrs.
105	3116 M St., NW G.H. & G. Kelly ACTION: Recom'd., 10/22/63.	7' brick & wood fence in rear of store & apt. bldg.
106	3146 M St., NW G.Y. Worthington, III ACTION: Recom'd., 10/22/63.	Erect 6' wood picket fence.
107	3115 "O" St., NW Geo. E. Herman ACTION: Recom'd., 10/22/63.	6'-wide, 2-story addn. at west side of exist. frame Victorian residence.

NO OG 64-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
109	1523-33rd St., NW Jean Scott	Coach light at front entr.
ACTION: Recom'd., 10/22/63.		
110	1517-31st St., NW M. K. Lewis	Coach light at front entr.
ACTION: Recom'd., 10/22/63.		
111	2615 "O" St., NW General Sands	New outside fixture on exist. outlet
ACTION: Recom'd., 10/22/63.		
112	3047½ N St., NW J. C. Chatel	Coach light at front entr.
ACTION: Recom'd., 10/22/63.		
113	3150 M St., NW Peter Heon (Restaurant)	Brick up openings in masonry wall; install new openings; alterate exist. showwindow proj. Install 1" applied brick veneer.
ACTION: Recom'd. as revised, provided that light sizes are uniform throughout, & muntins do not exceed 3/4" in width, 10/22/63.		

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS 11/19/63

NO OG 64-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
132	3146 M St., NW New Look Fashion Wigs, Inc. ACTION: Recom'd., as revised, 11/12/63.	Rev. of OG 64-98. 1 s-f, 18 sq-ft sign. Wood-white to match color of bldg. Ltrs-charcoal black. Straight Gothic.
134	1252 Wisc. Ave., NW Peter Hill Americana Paintings ACTION: Recom'd., 11/13/63.	1 d-f, 7 sq-ft sign. Hanging sign, w. i. Sign already made & complete.
135	3007 P St., NW Lovelle Barnard ACTION: Recom'd., 11/13/63.	Rev. of OG 3432. Eliminate proposed masonry steps. Retain exist. iron stairs. Install steps to basement.
136	3107 M St., NW Sol Meyerson (Commercial) ACTION: Recom'd., 11/13/63.	Install air cond. system in rear of bldg.
137	1901 Wisc. Ave., NW Dart Drug ACTION: Recom'd., provided ltrs. are reduced to 20" high, spaced to cover 25 sq-ft on a level line centered over the entr. Also omit upper lugs on ltrs. "D" & "R"., 11/13/63.	1 s-f, 25 sq-ft sign. Individ. ltrs. on brick wall with individ lighting. Ltr. faces black with stainless steel returns.
139	1669 Wisc. Ave., NW Craft House ACTION: Recom'd., 11/14/63.	1 d-f sign. 2.6 sq-ft each face. Black ltr. on white bckgd. Marine plywood, enamelled.
140	3328 "O" St., NW Gertrude S. Wyckoff ACTION: Recom'd., 11/14/63.	$5\frac{1}{2}$' high Calif. redwood posts with narrow horizontal rails between to replace present lattice trellis for support of wisteria vine.

APPENDIX 2

NO OG 64-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
141	3328 "O" St., NW Gertrude S. Wyckoff Edna Shepard Bean	Replace old & delapidated trellis fence on party line with picket fence similar to that now exist. in front of the 2 houses. $3\frac{1}{2}$' high.
ACTION: Recom'd., 11/14/63.		
142	3068-70 M St., NW Stuart C. Davidson (Apt. & commercial)	Addn. of dormer, fire escape & open porch to rear of bldg. No changes to exist. front.
ACTION: Recom'd., provided fire escape & balusters in rail are modified according to attached sketch. No objection to proposed dormer, 11/14/63.		
Inf. 126	3400 Reservoir Rd., NW Cecil F. Hilleary	Remodel exist. bldg.
ACTION: General design recom'd. in principle. Details of entranceway & door, recessed panels & fenestration on end elevations to be submitted with formal application for permit, 11/19/63.		
138	3400 Reservoir Rd., NW Cecil F. Hilleary	Rev. of OG 64-126. Revision of 34th St. elevation.
ACTION: Not recom'd. See action on OG 64-126, 11/19/63.		